

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報

平成 25 年度
(第 17 号)

**Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University**

for the Academic Year 2013

Volume XVII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2014・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2014

Quotatives Indicating Quotations in Pāli Commentarial Literature, II Quotatives with *āha*¹

Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ

Introduction

One strand of commentarial literature on Buddhist canonical writings discusses the meaning and the implications of the commented text. In this connection quotations serve the purpose of proof or affirmation, have supportive and illustrative functions, summarize contents, serve as mnemonics, etc. Such quotations can be marked or unmarked. In case they are marked several overt markers are used. They consist in a single word, even an indeclinable like *evam* “in that way”, *iti/ti* “thus”, *ettha* “here”, *tattha* “there”, *tena/tato/tasma* “therefore”, etc., or they contain a verb of saying (*āha*, *avoca*, *vadanti*) or writing (*likhanti*), possibly the name of the author or the source, or the generic name of the source (*aṭṭhakathā*, *gaṇṭhipada*, *ṭīkā*, etc.). Such markers we call quotatives following the practice in linguistic studies.² An author’s usage of quotatives may be dictated by the status of the text from which he quotes (being authoritative or not), be influenced by the common practice at his time for marking such quotations, but may also depend on the sources from which he borrows whole text passages, and on his own preferences.³

In the present contribution we investigate quotatives containing the verb *āha*, “he/she says”,⁴ *āhu*, “they say”, and try to find out how they were used, what type of text they indicate, whether they are limited to a certain time period, etc.

General quotatives with *āha*

As a “general quotative” I term quotatives used in various types of texts over a certain

¹ This is the second article in a series of articles in which I intend to deal with quotatives in Pāli commentarial literature. For the first see Kieffer-Pülz (in press).

² In linguistic studies various terms are used for such markers, quotative, quotative structure, quotative index, reporting frame, etc. (further terms in GÜLDEMANN 2008: 11). GÜLDEMANN who in his study on quotatives in African languages decides in favour of the term “quotative index,” defines it as follows: “A quotative index is a segmentally discrete linguistic expression which is used by the reporter for the orientation of the audience to signal in his/her discourse the occurrence of an adjacent representation of reported discourse.”

³ For a more detailed description see Kieffer-Pülz (in press).

⁴ From here on I use only “he says”, since in most cases the commentators are male. But, needless to say, there exist also texts by female authors as the *Therīgāthā*, the stanzas of the elder nuns. If Dhammapāla in commenting on this text, uses *āha* in a quotative referring to the author of the commented text, a female person, therefore, is the subject governing the verb, and naturally it then will be translated accordingly.

time period, in contrast to an “individual quotative”, which refers to quotatives defined by an author solely for usage in his own text.⁵ There exist a number of general quotatives containing *āha* in Pāli commentarial literature.⁶ Several of them indicate quotations from the *mūla* text, i.e. the text commented upon (“»...« *ti āha*.”; “... *āha* »...« *ti*.”; “*tasmā āha*: »...«”). The *mūla* text can be a canonical, or a commentarial text in case of sub- and subsubcommentaries. Regarding canonical texts the author is the Buddha himself or one of his followers (male and female) to whom the respective discourse, verse, etc., is ascribed. Furthermore, there are quotatives with *āha* that also introduce quotations from other than the *mūla* text (*āha ca*, *āha c’ ettha*, *tenāha*, *yathāha*).

In order to obtain final results regarding all texts, it would be necessary to check each *āha*-reference. This will not be done here, but rather we will make random samples in various *aṭṭhakathās* and *ṭīkā*s. All in all we have about 26.000 *āha*-references on the CSCD version 3⁷, comprising all *āha*-s whether in narrative or in exegetical portions. There are about 20.000 references for *āha* as a single word in commentarial literature (7348 references in the *aṭṭhakathās*; 12.399 in the *ṭīkā*s). From these just under hundred are used in the expression “*tasmā āha*” (seventeen references in the *aṭṭhakathās*, seventy-six in the *ṭīkā*s, see below § 4). Further twenty-nine belong to the expression *āha ca* (fifteen references in *aṭṭhakathās*; fourteen in *ṭīkā*s), and fourteen to *āha c’ ettha* (twelve references in the *aṭṭhakathās*, two in the *ṭīkā*s; see below § 6). The rest of the references belongs to the expressions “»...« *iti/ti āha*.” with its extended versions (below, § 1) and “... *āha* »...« *ti*.” (below, § 2).⁸ For *tenāha* we have 5.651 references (646 in *aṭṭhakathās*, 5005 in *ṭīkā*s), for the extension *ten’ evāha* just under one thousand (230 in *aṭṭhakathās*, 765 in *ṭīkā*s; see below § 3.1). Finally *yathāha* is used 1570 times (661 times in the *aṭṭhakathās*; 909 times in the *ṭīkā*s; see below § 5).

1. »...« *iti/ti āha*., “»...«, [this the author of the commented text] says.”

The expression “»...« *iti/ti āha*.” formed with the quotative marker *iti/ti* and the verb of speech *āha*, appears in narrative literature as well as in exegetical passages of commentaries. Whereas in narrative passages it follows reported speech, it concludes a quotation from the commented text in the exegetical parts of a commentary, and explains with what intention—according to the understanding of the commentator—the author of the commented text has said what is quoted. This is a well known usage in Sanskrit literature (see Tubb & Boose § 2.39.4). In Pāli literature this way of expression gains ground only slowly. Most of the “»...« *iti/ti āha*.” references in the *aṭṭhakathā* literature

5. For such “individual quotatives”, see Kieffer-Pülz (in press).

6. I am not aware of any individual quotative containing *āha*.

7. For the evaluation of the numbers of references CSCD version 3 is better than version 4, because it is possible to search an exact sequence of words. In version 4 as a minimum one word is allowed in between two words, leading to the effect that the reverse order of the one searched (*āha tasmā* instead of *tasmā āha*) is also included in the results. Although the numbers given here are only valid for the text corpus included in the CSCD, the material searched is of such a size that it allows to see tendencies in the numerical results.

8. Since these cannot be recorded by a simple search (as provided in the CSCD) we do not have absolute numbers regarding number and distribution of these quotatives.

(from the ca. 5th century AD onwards⁹) belong to narrative portions. This is especially valid for the commentaries on the *Dhammapada*, *Suttanipāta*, and *Jātakas* which as a direct result of their narrative character are replete with a high number of *āha* references (916, 454, and 2539). But it also holds true for Buddhaghosa's commentaries on the four large *Suttanikāyas*, where also most of the references appear in narrative portions (313 of 329 *āha* references in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsini* belong to narrative sections). Here we are only dealing with the usage of this quotative in exegetical passages, although sometimes the boundary between both might be blurred when the speaker in a narrative portion simultaneously is considered the author of the text.¹⁰

Turning to the usage in exegetical parts of the commentaries we, in addition to “»...« *iti/ti* or *ity/ty*¹¹ *āha*.” ([the author of the commented text] says: »...«) also have slightly extended versions like “»...« *iti/ti* or *ity/ty* *ādim āha*.” (“[the author of the commented text] says in the beginning: »...«.”, or “ [the author of the commented text] says: »...«, etc.”), “»...« *iti/ti* °*gāthāyo āha*.” (“[the author of the commented text] says the so-and-so stanzas: »...«.”), etc.¹² The subject which governs the verb *āha* is the author of the commented text. The quotations are often short, since in commenting the author may take up nearly each single word or words standing close together. But there are also longer quotations if a commentator comments on larger structural units. At the same time the quotation marked by this quotative, and standing at the end of a commented passage, may repeat the *pratīka* quoted in the beginning of this same passage,¹³ or even a longer passage containing the *pratīka*.¹⁴ This usage is similar to that of *tenāha/ten' evāha* (below, § 3.1), and *tena vuttaṃ*.¹⁵

In exactly the same sense as this quotative a second quotative is used, which only differs from the first by an inversion of the *āha*: it here precedes the quotation (... *āha* »...« *ti*.; see below § 2). This too is a common usage in Sanskrit literature (Tubb & Boose § 2.39.4). In Pāli literature it becomes the common quotative only from the *ṭīkā* literature onward. When *āha* is used as an element of quotatives in exegetical passages of

⁹ Regularly the 5th/6th centuries are given as dates for the *aṭṭhakathās*, but there are also still younger commentaries in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer as, for instance, the *Mahāniddesaṭṭhakathā* (9th century AD), the undated *Apadānaṭṭhakathā* which is considered the youngest of the *aṭṭhakathās* (von Hinüber 1996: § 306), or, the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā* which, if Dimitrov (*Jewel Mind*) is correct in his identification of its author as Ratnamati, would belong to the 10th century AD.

¹⁰ The *Thera-* and *Therīgāthā* may serve as an example. Although we see these books as a collection of verses compiled by some anonymous author, the commentator considers the *theras* and *therīs* whose verses are contained in this collection as the authors. In commenting he tells stories about them, and makes them speak their own verses. Hence the reported speech of the speaker in the narrative at the same time is a quotation from the commented text (see for instance n. 29).

¹¹ The variant *iccāha* is not very common, and, to my knowledge, not used in quotative function.

¹² In grammatical texts extensions as *vākyam*, *suttaṃ*, *paribhāsam* appear (“»...« *iti/ti* *vākyam/suttaṃ/paribhāsam āha*”).

¹³ This for instance is the case in Mp, which only has very few references of *āha* in exegetical passages (Mp II 176,19–20: *jeṭṭho ti aññasmim̐ jeṭṭhe sati kaniṭṭho āsaṃ na karoti, tasmā jeṭṭho* TI *ĀHA*; cf. Mp II 179,21–22.23–25.26–177,2; cf. Tha-a II 191,31–34: *tattha dipādako ti ...dassento dipādako* TI *ĀHA*).

¹⁴ For instance, Mp II 184,9–27: *khayāyā ti ettha pana ... phalaṃ sandhāya āsavānaṃ khayāyā* TI *ĀHA*.

¹⁵ Kieffer-Pülz (in press), § 3.

the commentaries at all,¹⁶ the “»...« *ti āha*.” quotative is used more often than the “... *āha* »...« *ti*.” quotative (§ 2) in the earlier among the *aṭṭhakathās*, i.e. in Buddhaghosa’s commentaries, where we often have less than ten references. In Dhammapāla’s *aṭṭhakathās* the two quotatives are used equally often, and there are between ca. twenty and seventy references. In the *gaṇṭhipada* and *ṭīkā* literature the number of references of the first quotative decreases,¹⁷ and the second quotative increases. Thus the distribution of these quotatives may serve as a hint regarding the chronological position of a text. Seen in this light it is to be assumed that the anonymous *Khuddakapāṭhaṭṭhakathā*, which compared to the number of all *āha* references (77) has a high number of quotatives in exegetical passages (50), and in which the second quotative (“... *āha* »...« *ti*”) is used twice as often as the first one (“»...« *ti āha*.”), is younger than Buddhaghosa’s and Dhammapāla’s commentaries.¹⁸ In the undated anonymous *Suttanipāṭaṭṭhakathā* which likewise presupposes these texts, the second quotative appears more than four times as often as the first (ca. 160 to 40). On the other hand a commentary like the *Mahāniddesaṭṭhakathā* dated to the ninth century in its *nigamana* has less than half references for the second quotative (10) compared to the first (26). Whether this is the case because its author borrowed from older texts¹⁹, or whether it is simply due to this author’s preference, cannot be said at present. But this text is against the general trend.

2. “... *āha* »...« *ti*.” “... [the author of the commented text] says: »...«.”

With respect to the second quotative the *āha* seemingly stands in the midst of a sentence, but it in fact follows a statement of the commentator (which may also include quotations from the commented text) and introduces a subsequent quotation from the commented text concluded by *iti*. The structure of exegetical sentences containing this quotative is identical to regular sentences in narrative portions.²⁰ But in commentarial passages the

¹⁶ This, for example, is the case in 16 of 329 *āha* references in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī*, in 76 of 413 in the *Papañcasūdanī*, 23 of 34 in the *Itivuttakaṭṭhakathā*, 40 of 77 in the *Khuddakapāṭhaṭṭhakathā*, 192 of 454 in the *Suttanipāṭaṭṭhakathā*, etc. The percentage of *āha* references used in quotatives in exegetical portions increases in the *ṭīkā* literature.

¹⁷ In the undated *Paṭisambhidāmaggaṇṭhipada* (with 385 references for the second quotative) or the *Vibhaṅgamūlaṭṭīkā* (with 127 references for the second quotative) there is not one reference for the first quotative. In the first volume of the *Sāratthadīpanī* (12th century AD) we have nearly four hundred references for the second quotative, but only about twenty for the first; in the *Vimativinodanīṭīkā* (early 13th century AD) the relation is similar.

¹⁸ This is confirmed by other quotatives, not used often in earlier *aṭṭhakathās*, but more often in *ṭīkā*s, as for instance the *hoti/honti c’ ettha* quotative indicating non-canonical stanzas. It is used in the *Khuddakapāṭhaṭṭhakathā* twice where all the *aṭṭhakathā* parallels have the older quotative *ten’ etaṃ vuccati*, see Kieffer-Pülz (in preparation), A § 2.1.

¹⁹ Upasena, the author of the *Mahāniddesa*, based himself on the *Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā* (Kieffer-Pülz 2009: 145ff.), and borrowed from the *Suttanipāṭaṭṭhakathā* when he wrote his commentary (von Hinüber 1996: § 289)

²⁰ As an example of a narrative sentence, see Vv-a 66,3–4: *rājā nāgare sannipāṭepetvā āha “imasmim nāgare atthi kassaci ettakaṃ suvaṇṇaṃ” ti?* “The king having assembled [the citizens] in the town said: »Is there anyone in that town possessing so much gold?«”. Compare the similar structure of a commentarial passage from the It-a II 77,33–78,2: *saddhādiguṇa-visesa-paṭilābhakāraṇato devūppattihetuto ca manusattaṃ devānaṃ abhisammataṃ* TI *ĀHA*: “*manussattaṃ kho bhikkhu devānaṃ sugatigamanasaṅkhātān*” *ti* (It 77,6–7). “The human state is admired by the *devas* on account of its being the means of acquiring distinction in such good qualities as faith and so on and on account of its being the root cause of arising as

subject governing *āha* is the author of the commented text,²¹ quoted subsequently.²² The statement preceding *āha* is the commentator's interpretation why, what for, by what, etc., the author of the commented text stated something. Depending on this interpretation the preceding statement ends in a nominative naming the subject by name or title (rare), by a word ending in °*kāmo* (rare²³), or by an active present participle (very common, especially *dassento*);²⁴ it may end in an infinitive (partly common), less often in an accusative (the latter sometimes formed by adding °*attham* or combined with *sandhāya*²⁵) naming the objective to which the quotation tends according to the commentator's opinion ("in order to/wishing to ... [the author of the text] says: »...«"); it may end in an ablative (°*ā*, °*to*) giving the reason why—according to the opinion of the commentator—the subsequent quotation has been said by the author of the commented text ("because of so-and-so [the author of the text] says: »...«"); it may also end in an instrumental (often formed by adding °*vasena*²⁶) indicating by what the author of the commented text has said something; it may end in an absolutive (*katvā*, *gahetvā*, etc.) stating what the author of the commented text has done, grasped, etc., before he said what is subsequently quoted, or a whole sentence, in the earlier commentaries, often a question, is ending in *iti/ti* before the *āha*, and one has to understand that the commentator here formulates a question which in his opinion is answered by the author of the commented text ("[Answering the question:] »so-and-so«, [the author of the

a *deva*. Insofar [the author of the *Itivuttaka*] SAYS: »**The human state, monk, is reckoned by the *devas* as going to the happy destiny**«.» (I slightly rearranged Masfield's translation, It-a transl. II 594, since from his translation the subject of *āha* does not become evident).

^{21.} There are cases where the source is given in addition, namely when the commentator refers to a text different from the commented one, see for instance Vin-vn-ṭ I 134,8–9: *idam eva SANDHĀYĀHA Padabhāṇane "santatiṃ vikopeti" ti* (Vin III 73,25).

^{22.} As can be seen in editions and translations of Pāli texts this was not always clear to the editors and translators, who characterised words not stemming from the commented text as quotations, and only partly recognized quotations as quotations. See for instance It-a II 78,1 where *abhisammātan* is falsely characterized as a quotation, because it stands before *iti*, and where the quotation following *āha* is only partly characterized as a quotation; or It-a II 150,13–14, where words of the commentator preceding *āha* are characterized as a quotation. For a mistranslation of Thī-a 15,2–3, based on the wrong connection of the *āha* with the preceding statement, see n. 29. Masfield in his translation of the It-a often interprets this *āha* which is governed by the unexpressed *mūlakāra* wrongly as an objection, which he mostly introduces by an added "[Lest it should be asked]," "It was lest it be asked", "But, lest it be asked", etc. (It-a I 78,32–34, It-a transl. I 199; It-a I 89,1–3, It-a transl. 222; It-a I 96,25, It-a transl. 244; etc.).

^{23.} Altogether thirty-five references on the CSCD, *dassetukāmo* (8x), *vattukāmo* (5x), *kātukāmo* (4x), the remaining words appear only once each. There are no references for this combination in the Jā-ṭ, Mhv-ṭ, Mmd, Paṭiṣ-gp, Simāl-v, and Upās, texts not contained in the database on CSCD.

^{24.} More than 1000 references in the *ṭikā* layer, whereas in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer there are only some 300 references, and where *dassento āha* is used as a finite verb at the end of a sentence, too.

^{25.} Regarding *sandhāyāha* only part of the references introduce a quotation. It more often concludes a sentence in which it is explained with respect to which object the *pratīka* has been said by the author of the commented text ("[the author of the commented text] says so-and-so (*pratīka*) with respect to so-and-so"). In those cases there is no quotation in addition to the *pratīka*. A search with CSCD version 4 leads to 186 references for *sandhāyāha* in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer. Only fifty-six times does it introduce a quotation. Within the *ṭikā* layer there are about 600 references.

^{26.} The construction with an instrumental (with *vasena*) is used especially often in the Paṭiṣ-gp (78 references) whereas in all other Pāli texts on the CSCD there are only seven references, namely in Dhammapāla's *ṭikās* (Sv-pt I 66; Ps-pt I 291; II 121; Spk-pt I 76; Ppk-anuṭ 109), in the Vjb (33,5), and the Mogg-p-ṭ (72).

commented text] says: »...«²⁷), or that the commentator gives the intention with which the author of the commented text said what is quoted subsequently (“[Insofar as] ... (referring back to what has been stated in the *iti* clause preceding *āha*), [the author of the commented text] says: »...«²⁸). For this last variant (*iti/ti āha* »...« *ti*.) there are only very few examples in Buddhaghosa’s commentaries. The number rises in Dhammapāla’s *aṭṭhakathās*,²⁹ where it mostly is used in case of a question preceding the *ti āha*. It in general becomes the most common variant of this quotative in the subcommentarial literature. Only in some texts are other combinations preferred, namely a preceding infinitive in the *Vinayavinicchayaṭṭhikā* named *Vinayatthasārasandīpanī*³⁰ (2nd half 13th century AD; about 110 times *ti āha* »...« *ti*, and about 350 times *°tum āha* »...« *ti*), in Saṅgharakkhita’s *Moggallāna-pañjika-ṭhikā* (*Sāratthavilāsini*) (first third of the 13th century AD³¹; 117 of 159 references with an infinitive), and in the anonymous and undated (between 7–9th and second half of the twelfth centuries³²) *Paṭisambhidā-maggagaṇṭhipada* (about thirty times *ti āha* »...« *ti*; about hundred-thirty times *°tum āha* »...« *ti*). Second most in the commentarial literature is the variant with an active present participle preceding *āha* (*°nto āha* »...« *ti*.)—by the way the most common variant in the younger *aṭṭhakathās* (Kh-p, Sn-a). In Jāgara’s *Pācityādiyojanā* (19. Jh.) 715 of 1677 *āha* references belong to this second quotative with *dassento* preceding *āha*. Nevertheless there are also texts in which this quotative is used not at all as in the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā*, a commentary with an already low number of *āha* references (42) of which most are used in narrative sections.

27. Thī-a 15,2–3: *kuto pana sumuttā sādhumuttā* *ti āha* *tīhi khujjehi muttiyā* *ti*; *tīhi vaṅkakehi parimuttiyā* *ti* *attho*. “[To answer] in what manner she is well released, properly released, she (i.e. the author of the commented text) says: »by the release from three crooked things;« the meaning is: by the perfect release from three bent things.” Pruitt (Thī-a transl. 24) connected the *āha* wrongly with the preceding statement, “Now why did she say [she was] well released, properly released? By my release means of the three crooked things (*khujjehi*) means: ‘by my perfect release by means of the three bent things (*vaṅkakehi*).’ This is the meaning.”

28. Sp-ṭ I 22,1–3: *yadi aṭṭhakathāsu vuttaṃ sabbam pi pamāṇaṃ, evaṃ sati tatha pamādalekhāpi pamāṇaṃ siyā* *ti āha* *vajjayitvāna pamādalekhan* *ti* (Sp 3,2). “If it were so [that what] is said in the [early] commentaries all [is] authoritative, then even a careless writing would be authoritative, [insofar the author of the commented text] says: having barred careless writing[s].”

29. In the subcommentaries on the *Suttapiṭaka* ascribed to Dhammapāla (*Dīgha-*, *Majjhima-*, and *Samyuttanikāya*) there are especially high numbers of *āha* references 1360, 1551, 1023. From all the other *ṭhikās* only two have such high scores, namely Sāriputta’s *Sāratthadīpanī* (12th century AD; 1098 references), and Jāgara’s *Pācityādiyojanā* (19th century; 1677 references).

30. This *ṭhikā* is not the one written by Vācissara as Norman 1983, p. 130, states. The *ṭhikā* ascribed to Vācissara in the *Gandhavaṃsa* is called *Yogavinicchaya* there (Gv 62.10); from this *Yogavinicchaya* a quotation is found in Saṅgharakkhita’s *Khuddasikkhā-abhinavaṭṭhikā* (*Khuddas-nt* 374,23–25) with the remark that it was written by him (*tathā ca vuttaṃ amhehi Yogavinicchaye*: “...”). The *Vinayasārasandīpanī* on the other hand is ascribed to a Mahā-Upatissa Mahāthera in the *Piṭakat Samuñ* no. 299. Whoever was its author wrote in the second half of the thirteenth century at the earliest, since he quotes from Parakramabāhu II’s *Nissandeha* (Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I, p. 30, 52).

31. Saṅgharakkhita is mentioned as *mahāsāmi* at the time of King Vijayabāhu III (1232–36) in the *Mahāvaṃsa* (Mhv 81.77). Since he also was a pupil of Sāriputta, he probably wrote at the end of the twelfth and in the first third of the thirteenth century AD.

32. The author of the *Paṭis-gp* mentions Dhammapāla’s *Puggalapaññatti-aṭṭhakathā* (ca. 7/8/9th century AD; *Paṭis-gp* C° 45,6), and is itself quoted by Sāriputta of Poḷonnaruva (2nd half 12th century AD) in his commentary on the *Samantapāsādikā*, the *Sāratthadīpanī* (Sp-ṭ I 104 104,19–21 = *Paṭis-gp* C° 23,15f.).

3.1 *Tenāha/ten' evāha* »...« *ti*, “Therefore/Exactly or only therefore [the author of the commented text] says: »...«.”

A very widespread quotative to introduce quotations is *tenāha* “therefore he says” (5651 references; 646 in *aṭṭhakathās* [152 are combined with *bhagavā*], 5005 in *ṭikās* [166 combined with *bhagavā*]), or *ten' evāha* “exactly or only therefore he says” (995 references, 230 in *aṭṭhakathās* [two are combined with *bhagavā*], 765 in *ṭikās* [nine combined with *bhagavā*]) in general at the end of a paragraph. The differentiation in *tenāha* and *ten' evāha* varies in the different countries tradition³³

The quotation thus introduced mostly is evidence for the commentator's explanation of the *mūlakāra*'s intention preceding the *tenāha* quotative. In the earlier Pāli literature we have 417 references for *tenāha*, none for *ten' evāha* (at least in the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition as preserved on the CSCD). These references are distributed over the *Mahāniddesa* (209), and the *Cullaniddesa* (152), commentaries on parts of the *Suttanipāta* ascribed to Sāriputta Thera, and included in the *Suttapiṭaka*. The remaining references are in the paracanonical texts *Nettipakaraṇa* (53) and *Peṭakopadesa* (4). The quotation introduced by *tenāha* frequently consists in the same words as those quoted in the beginning as *pratīka*. In the *Mahāniddesa*, as a rule, the stanza from the *Suttanipāta* commented on is given in the beginning of a paragraph. Single words from it are then explained. In the end the whole *Suttanipāta* stanza is quoted again, and in that case it is introduced by *tenāha*, mostly (in 87 percent—182 cases) naming the subject, namely the Lord (*bhagavā*), or some Thera, etc., – whoever is mentioned as the transmitter³⁴ in the *Suttanipāta*.³⁵ Thus *tenāha* here introduces portions from the *mūla* text. A similar observation has been made by Alsdorf with respect to the *Vessantarajātaka*. Here the stanzas from the old *Jātakaṭṭhakathā* are generally introduced by an active verb (*āha*, *avoca*, etc.) whereas those from different texts are introduced by a passive construction (*tena vuttaṃ*). This holds true for the whole *Jātakaṭṭhakathā* as a survey of the usage in this *aṭṭhakathā* has made plain.³⁶ Regarding other *aṭṭhakathās* the quotations introduced

³³. Sv I 67,5 (E^c) reads *ten' evāha* without variants, and the corresponding passage in B^c has *tenāha*.

³⁴. In a few cases other persons count as the authors, namely the Thera Tissametteyya for the first stanza of the seventh chapter, and Thera Sāriputta for the first eight stanzas in the 16th chapter (*Sāriputtasuttaniddesa*) (447, 457, 464, 466, 467, 471, 478, 479), the brāhmaṇa Māgandiya (for stanzas 838 here E^c wrongly gives *bhagavā* as the subject, 840).

³⁵. In case of the *Cullaniddesa* the 152 references are distributed over four subjects (49 times *bhagavā*, 46 times *so brāhmaṇo*, 16 times *thero Piṅgiyo*, and 41 times *so paccekasambuddho*), but the usage is identical with that in the *Mahāniddesa* with which in fact it forms one commentary. The *Netti* contains 53 references (five times mere *tenāha*, 29 times *tenāha bhagavā*, and 18 times *tenāha āyasmā Mahākaccāyano*), the *Peṭakopadesa* has only four references, one combined with *bhagavā*. Since all introduce quotations from the canon, the Buddha is the subject even in those cases where he is not explicitly mentioned as such. Interestingly the *Peṭakopadesa* in identically structured cases has the quotative *tena vuccate* (Peṭ 139,7–8 [DN, etc.]; 211,2,7 [DN, etc.]; 215,22 [SN, etc.]), an expression not used elsewhere, and therefore to be considered a corruption of the very common *tena vuccati* (used in the same way as *tenāha*). This the more, since there are *tena vuccati* quotatives in comparable sentences in the *Peṭakopadesa* (Peṭ 139,12f.16.24; 224,22; 243,12.16.22.26; 244,2.6).

³⁶. Kieffer-Pülz (in press), § 3.

by *tenāha*, etc., are repetitions of the *pratīka*,³⁷ come from the same portion of the *mūla* text, but being different from the *pratīka*,³⁸ or from another portion of the *mūla* text,³⁹ or from any other canonical text.⁴⁰ It may be that in single commentaries a specific usage was observed as mentioned above for the *Jātakatṭhakathā*. But this needs investigation for each single text.

In the *ṭīkā* layer we have 5005 *tenāha* references, and 765 *ten' evāha* references. Here they are especially often employed in the old *ṭīkā*s on the *Suttapīṭaka* ascribed to Dhammapāla, i.e. those on the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (732 references), the *Papañcasūdanī* (1034 references), and the *Sāratthappakāsinī* (814 references). If *tenāha/ten' evāha* is combined with *bhagavā* it refers to some canonical text, but it can be combined with any other specific source.⁴¹ Since in case of a subcommentary there is a canonical text and the corresponding *aṭṭhakathā*, or in case of non canonical texts like, for instance, grammars, a *mūla* text, and an earlier commentary on it, the *tenāha* reference in a subcommentary can also refer to the earlier commentary. In case of the *Mukhamattadīpanī*, for instance, the *tenāha* references refer to the author of the *Kaccāyanavutti*, an anonymous older commentary.⁴²

3.2 *Tenāhu*: »...« *ti*, “Therefore they say: »...«.”

Tenāhu “therefore they say” is used 156 times in all the Pāli scriptures on the CSCD version 4, and mostly combined with an expressed subject: 121 times with “the Ancients” (*porāṇā*), twenty-four times with “the teachers of the [old] commentaries” (*aṭṭhakathācariyā*), and three times with “teachers” (*ācariyā*). Of the *tenāhu porāṇā* references the oldest is in the *Milindapañha*, where it introduces several stanzas not traced elsewhere.⁴³ Seventy-two times it appears in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer, and forty-eight times in the *ṭīkā* layer. Adikaram (1953: 16ff.) who investigated the sources of the *aṭṭhakathā* layer⁴⁴ thought it probable that *porāṇā*, *porāṇācariyā* and *dhammasaṅgāhakā* referred to the same source, and that the *porāṇā* were identical with the *aṭṭhakathācariyā* (p. 21f.). Taking the *ṭīkā* commentaries into account too, we can see that the same quotation given as a statement of the *aṭṭhakathācariyas* in Buddhaghosa's commentaries, and in commentaries by several other authors, is mentioned as a statement of the *porāṇās* in Dhammapāla's *Udānaṭṭhakathā*, and in Sāriputta's subcommentaries on the *Aṅguttara-*

^{37.} Sv I 143,11–12 from DN I 48,3.

^{38.} Sv I 113,12 (*pratīka: satī sammussati*, DN I 19,14), Sv I 113,28–29 (*ten' āha*: quotation of the adjacent sentence, DN I 19,14f.).

^{39.} Sv I 67,5–8 from DN III 135,11–16, etc.

^{40.} Sv I 172,10–11 from Tha 1232; SN I 190,16–17.

^{41.} E.g., *ten' evāha cĀriyaMātraccevā* (sic; Vjb 15,16), where it introduces a stanza from a text by Māṭṛceṭa (see Kieffer-Pülz 2013: I, p. 100f.).

^{42.} Mmd B^c 25f., 27, 57, 61, 62, 63, 82, 88, 98, 103, 104 (*tenāha*), 37, 99, 276 (*ten' evāha*). In fact nearly all quotations in the Mmd originate from the *Vutti*, whether they are indicated by *āha ca* (with or without *Vuttiyaṃ*), by *ti/ty (ādim) āha, ti vatvā, ti vuttattā*, or *vuttañ ca*.

^{43.} Mil 22,7 (simply *tenāhu* in Mil E^c, with *porāṇā* in Mil B^c).

^{44.} He counted 116 quotations in the Pāli *aṭṭhakathās*, and stated that many such quotations were found in Buddhaghosa's commentaries, in the Nidd-a, and the Paṭi-a, but only few in commentaries ascribed to Dhammapāla.

nikāya and the *Samantapāsādikā*. Furthermore, it seems that different countries' traditions may vary with respect to the name of the source. Thus in the Burmese edition of the *Papañcasūdanī* we find *aṭṭhakathācariyā* as the source, whereas the PTS edition gives *porāṇā* without any variant.⁴⁵ A second example is a stanza given in the *Atthasālinī* (As 84,36) with *tenāhu porāṇā* as the source.⁴⁶ Dhammapāla in the old *ṭīkā* on the *Dīghanikāya*, and Sāriputta in his *ṭīkā* on the *Samantapāsādikā* both give the same verse, but mention the source as *tenāhu aṭṭhakathācariyā* (Sv-pṭ III 239,23 = Sp-ṭ̣ III 472).⁴⁷

4. *Tasmā āhā*tasmāha: »...«, “Therefore [the author of the commented text] says: »...«.”

The quotative *tasmā āha* has the same function as the quotative *tenāha* (§ 3.1), namely mostly to introduce quotations from the commented text. In the case of the *aṭṭhakathā*s this is the respective canonical text, in case of the subcommentaries the respective *aṭṭhakathā*. The quotations serve as a kind of affirmation concluding the commentator's interpretation.⁴⁸ *Tasmā āha*, however, is used only rarely. There are altogether ninety-three references on the CSCD version 3 (seventeen in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer; seventy-six in the *ṭīkā* layer).⁴⁹ From the seventeen references in the *aṭṭhakathā* only one is in Buddhaghosa's commentaries on the *Suttapiṭaka* (Mp IV 79,7 from AN IV 173), and this is identical with the single one in the *Samantapāsādikā* (Sp I 133,8 from Vin III 3,26); in Dhammapāla's commentaries we find seven in all.⁵⁰ Seven further references are contained in the *Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā*, and one in the *Paṭisambhidhāmaggaṭṭhakathā*. The subcommentaries (*ṭīkā*) include seventy-six references in eleven subcommentaries. Most of them are contained in the *purāṇaṭṭhikā*s on the *Suttapiṭaka* ascribed to Dhammapāla, namely twenty-nine in the *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭṭhikā*, nineteen in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinīpurāṇaṭṭhikā*, and seven in the *Sāratthappakāsinīpurāṇaṭṭhikā*. The *Visuddhimaggamahāṭṭhikā*, on the other hand, also ascribed to this Dhammapāla has only two. In Sāriputta's subcommentary on the *Manorathapūraṇī* – different from his Vinaya texts where there is none (Sp-ṭ̣, Pālim) – there are seven. For the rest of the texts only three (Vjb), two (Abhidh-av-nṭ̣, Ppk-anuṭ̣, Vism-mhṭ̣), or one reference (As-mūlaṭ̣, Kkh-pṭ̣, Vmv) is given. It is significant that younger Burmese authors, like Tipiṭakālaṅkāra (middle of 17th

⁴⁵ Ps I 83,22 (E° *porāṇā*; B° *aṭṭhakathācariyā*) = Spk III 138,25 (E° with v.l. *porāṇā*) = Mp II 53,7–8 = Paṭis-a I 127,4–5 = III 600,14 = Nidd-a I I 67,7 = As 217,30–31 = Vibh-a 310,18 *tenāhu aṭṭhakathācariyā: bujjanakassa puggalassa aṅgā ti* (v.l. add *vā*) *bojjhaṅgā ti*; Ud-a 305,27–28 = Mp-nṭ̣ B° III 230 = Sp-ṭ̣ III 432,18–19: *tenāhu porāṇā: bujjanakassa puggalassa aṅgā ti bojjhaṅgā ti*.

⁴⁶ Adikaram quotes the evidence from the *Atthasālinī* (Adikaram 1953: Appendix IIa, p. xix, no. 42). Since he did not consider the *ṭīkā*s, he could not see the divergence in naming the sources.

⁴⁷ By the way, the same stanza with some neutral introductory statement is found in Ps-pṭ̣ I 213 = Mp-nṭ̣ II 367 (*tathā hi vuttaṃ*).

⁴⁸ Thī-a 265,23–24: *yasmā kāmesu kāmahetu ime sattā vadhabandhanadukkhāni anubhavanti pāpuṇanti, TASMĀ ĀHA: asakāmā ti* (Thī vs. 506, App. II). “Since these beings **suffer**, arrive at, the **pains of slaughter and bonds in sexual pleasures**, with sensual pleasures as the cause, she (i.e. the author of the commented text) **THEREFORE SAYS: through inferior sensual pleasure.**” (~Thī-a transl. 370; omission of original words, and bold setting are made by the present author).

⁴⁹ From the texts not on the CSCD, the Jā-ṭ̣, Mhv-ṭ̣, Mmd, Paṭis-gp, Sīmāl-v, and the Upās do not have any reference.

⁵⁰ Cp-a (2), Pv-a (1), Tha-a (3), Thī-a (1).

century, Pālim-nt), Ñāṇābhivamsa (1800; Sv-anṭ), Jāgara (19th century; Pāc-y), etc., do not use this quotative at all.

5. *Yathāha*: »...«, “As [the author of the quoted text] says: »...«.”

There are 1731 *yathāha* references in the text corpus on the CSCD (twelve in the para-canonical layer, 661 in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer, 909 in the *ṭīkā* layer, etc.).⁵¹ In general *yathāha* introduces quotations cited as a proof for a preceding statement.⁵² They may originate from another passage in the *mūla*-text, but more often they come from a different, often a canonical,⁵³ source. If several quotations are given, the second may be introduced by *yathā cāha* (twenty-nine references). Sometimes the generic name (*Gaṇṭhipade*,⁵⁴ *Padabhājane*,⁵⁵ *Aṭṭhakathāyaṃ*⁵⁶) or the specific name of a source are added in the locative (*Dhammapade*,⁵⁷ *Paṭisambhidāyaṃ*,⁵⁸ *Paṭisambhidāmagge*⁵⁹). In the subcommentarial literature it is also used to indicate quotations from the *aṭṭhakathā*. In all cases the author of the respective text is the intended subject of *āha*. Some texts are conspicuous, because of the large number of *yathāha*-quotations, so the *Vinaya-vinicchayaṭṭhā* with 487 references, of which nearly all allude to the *Vinaya* and its commentary. None of the other texts reaches even 100 references. In other texts the usage is restricted to specific portions as in the Sp, where it occurs only in the Pārājika- and Pācittiya sections.

6. *Āha ca*: »...«, “it is said: »...«”; *āha c’ ettha*: »...«, “it is said in this connection/in this respect: »...«.”

Within the texts on the CSCD there are only twenty-nine references for *āha ca* indicating quotations (fifteen in the *aṭṭhakathās*, fourteen in the *ṭīkā*s). From texts not contained in the CSCD we have ten references in Vajirabuddhi’s/Vimalabuddhi’s *Mukhamattadīpanī* (10–11th century AD), and one in Chapaṭa’s *Sīmālāṅkārasaṅghavaṇṇanā* (15th century AD). For *āha c’ ettha* we have fourteen references (twelve in the *aṭṭhakathās*, two in the *ṭīkā*s).⁶⁰ These quotatives are used to add a quotation (often stanzas) from a different

⁵¹ From the texts not on the CSCD, the Jā-ṭ, Mhv-ṭ, Mmd, Sīmāl-v, have no references. The Paṭis-gp has one introducing quotations from four different canonical texts (Paṭis-gp 2,16–20 quoting from Khp 3,4, Sn Vs. 262; MN III 205,19–21; SN I 220,22–24; AN I 89,29–31); the Upās has sixteen references (Upās 147,1; 177,13; 229,1; etc.) quoting from canonical texts (AN, DN, MN, Vibh), from the *Saddhammopāyana* (Upās 286,12–16), the *Visuddhimagga* (Upās 303,16ff.; etc.) and some unidentified sources (Upās 229,1–5).

⁵² E.g., Cp-a 277,23ff. = Sv-pt I 87,24ff. = Sv-anṭ I 248: *saṅkhepato dasavidhā, tā pana pāḷiyaṃ* (Sv-anṭ *Buddhavaṃsapāḷiyaṃ*) *sarūpato āgatā yeva. YATHĀHA: vicinanto tadā dakkhiṃ paṭhamam dānapāramin” ti* (Bv II vs. 117) *ādi. YATHĀ CĀHA: “kati nu kho ...”*; Nett 30,8.17.26.32 (YATHĀHA BHAGAVĀ ... YATHĀ CĀHA BHAGAVĀ (three times); Ps-pt I B° 54. (quoting from the DN).

⁵³ Only in thirty-one cases is *yathāha* combined with *bhagavā*. But not only in this combinations it refers to canonical sources.

⁵⁴ Vin-vn-ṭ I 299,21–23.

⁵⁵ Referring to the word analysis in the *Vinaya*.

⁵⁶ Hundred-fifty times in the Vin-vn-ṭ referring to the *Samantapāsādikā*.

⁵⁷ Vjb 351,17–20.

⁵⁸ It-a I 140,10–12 (Paṭis I 131); Sp II 409,21–410,17 (Paṭis I 177).

⁵⁹ Spk-pt I B° 54.

⁶⁰ No references are found in Ja-ṭ, Mhv-ṭ, Mmd, Paṭis-gp, Sīmāl-v, Upās.

context or text. The unexpressed subject of *āha* is the author of the quoted text.

Six of the fifteen *āha ca* references in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer are identically transmitted in the *Khuddhakapāṭhaṭṭhakathā* and the *Suttanipāṭaṭṭhakathā*, where they introduce passages from the *Suttanipāṭa*, the *Itivuttaka* and the *Aṅguttaranikāya*.⁶¹ The authorship of these commentaries—it is probable that they had different authors—and their date are uncertain, except that they both presuppose Buddhaghosa.⁶² Besides these six references there are a further three, of which two are only attested to in the Burmese manuscript tradition. One of them is in the Burmese edition of Buddhaghosa's commentary on the *Majjhimanikāya* (Ps III 369,14), for which we have parallels in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (Sv I 275,29), and the *Suttanipāṭaṭṭhakathā* (Sn-a II 452,10). Instead of the *āha ca* of the Burmese CSCD edition Ps E^e has *āha*, and S^e has *āhacca*. Sv and Sn-a E^e, and CSCD have no quotative, but Sv E^e, and Sn-a E^e give *āha ca* respectively *āha* as variants of Burmese manuscripts.⁶³ The text following *āha ca* begins with *dukkaraṃ* (or *atidukkaraṃ*)⁶⁴, and appears in the guise of a quotation from the *Milindapañha*. But in fact only some words have a literal correspondence.⁶⁵ The three factors (*āha ca* only in the Burmese tradition, no quotative in parallel quotations, and no literal quotation following) make it doubtful that *āha ca* originally belonged to the text. Possibly the *āha ca* was introduced by some scribe who knew that *āha ca* introduces quotations, and who thought the following portion to be such a quotation from the *Milindapañha*, a close assumption because of the writing style.

The second instance of an *āha ca* quotative is in the Burmese edition (not in E^e) of Buddhaddatta's *Uttaravinicchaya* (6th century AD), a verse text. *Āha ca* here is inserted before stanza 335. The author of the *Uttaravinicchayaṭīkā* (2nd half of the 13th century AD)⁶⁶ quotes this *āha ca* and explains it by *aṭṭhakathācariyo Mātikaṭṭhakathāyam*, thus identifying stanza 335 as a quotation from the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī* (Kkh 36,25–26). This shows that by the 13th century AD the *āha ca* was already present in the *Uttaravinicchaya* manuscript commented on by the *ṭīkākāra*. It furthermore makes plain that the *āha ca* was inserted as a quotative signaling that stanza 335 was not composed by Buddhaddatta, but rather copied from some other text, i.e. the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī*. Whether the *āha ca* was there from the very beginning or whether it was inserted by some knowledgeable scribe between the 6th and the 13th centuries AD, because he knew that this verse was borrowed from the Kkh (this to my opinion is more likely), cannot be decided. The last reference in the *aṭṭhakathā* layer stems from the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā*

⁶¹ Khp-a 136,7 (B^e *āha ca*; E^e *āha cāpi*; Sn 454 = Sn-a I 299); 145,2 (= Sn-a I 300,30); Khp-a 147,14–16 (Sn 42ab = Sn-a I 300,30); Khp-a 147,23–25 prose (AN I 87,1 = Sn-a I 300,30); Khp-a 150,14–16 (It 107,4 = Sn-a I 300,30); Khp-a 246,1–2 (AN II 17,21 = Sn-a I 193,20).

⁶² von Hinüber 1996: § 252ff.

⁶³ Ps III 369,13ff. = Sv I 275,28ff. = Sn-a II 452,10ff.: *vuttaṃ etaṃ Nāgasenattheren' eva Milindarañṇā puṭṭhena*: (Ps E^e add *āha*, B^e *āha ca*, S^e *āhacca*; Sv E^e om; B^e *āha ca*; B^e CSCD om.): *dukkaraṃ* (Sv E^e, S^e *atidukkaraṃ*) ...

⁶⁴ *Atidukkaraṃ* in those mss. which do not read *āha* or *āha ca*. Possibly the *āha* was misread by some scribes as *ati*, since in Mil 168,28f. we have *dukkaraṃ*.

⁶⁵ Helmer Smith (Sn-a II 452,29) refers to Mil 167–169. Mil 168,28–29 is literal.

⁶⁶ If the ascription of this text to the same author as the one who wrote the *Vinayavinicchayaṭīkā* (Piṭ-sm 300) is true.

(2nd half 10th? century AD⁶⁷; Bv-a 77,34) where it introduces stanzas from the *Visuddhimagga* (Vism 74,27–75,4).⁶⁸

Within the *ṭikā* layer *āha cā* as a reporting frame is found only in four texts, namely in the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* (2nd half of the tenth century AD), the *Mukhamattadīpanī* (10th/11th century AD), the *Saddanīti* (12th century AD), and the *Sīmālankārasaṅghavaṇṇanā* (15th century AD).⁶⁹ The author of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*, according to Dimitrov (*Jewel Mind*) the same Ratna who wrote the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā*, uses it twice to introduce stanzas (Vjb 3,7–9; 246,2–6). In both cases the sources are not traced. The latter stanza is copied by the author of the *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇīpurāṇaṭikā* (Kkh-pt 78,23–27) who here borrowed a larger text block from the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā*. If the identification of the authors of the *Vajirabuddhiṭikā* and the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā* were correct, these two sources would stem from one author. Thus the number of different authors who used this quotative would be reduced. Vimalabuddhi's or Vajirabuddhi's *Mukhamattadīpanī* contains ten references for *āha ca*, two are combined with the name of the source, namely *Vuttiyaṃ* referring to the *Kaccāyanavutti*.⁷⁰ From the remaining eight six refer to the *Kaccāyanavutti*,⁷¹ and one each to the *Kaccāyanappakaraṇa* and an *Aṭṭhakathā*.⁷² Hence Vimalabuddhi uses *āha ca* only once for the *mūla*-text, but eight times for the *Vutti*, the earliest transmitted commentary on the *Kaccāyanappakaraṇa*. Only once did he use it for a text not belonging to the grammatical tradition. In Aggavaṃsa's *Saddanīti* (12th century AD) we have altogether eight references, one combined with the name of the source (Sadd 317,9) referring to the *Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā*. In all cases *āha ca* introduces stanzas. One of the stanzas couldn't be traced (Sadd 77,14–16), one originates from the canon (Sadd 451,28–29 from Ap 497,15–18), one from Buddhaddatta's *Abhidhammāvatāra* (Sadd 548,2 from Abhidh-av 43,14), and four from Dhammapāla's *Visuddhimaggamahāṭikā* with parallels in Dhammapāla's *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭikā* (ca. 10th century AD), and Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī*.⁷³ Chapaṭa uses the *āha ca* together with

⁶⁷. So Dimitrov (*Jewel Mind*) who ascribes the *Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā* to the monk scholar Ratna (second half of the tenth century AD).

⁶⁸. Horner obviously was not aware of this usage of *āha ca*. She, therefore, translated as if the subject of the preceding sentence also governed the *āha* (*ime dasa guṇē disvā rukkhamūlaṃ upagato' smī ti vadati. āha ca*: “stanzas ...”, Bv-a 77,33–34), “Having seen these ten special qualities, he spoke, saying, ‘I approached the root of a tree’, and said: ‘Reliance is spoken of ...’” (Bv-a transl. 114). But the *āha ca* clearly introduces stanzas from the *Visuddhimagga*, and should be translated as “And it is said (i.e. in the *Visuddhimagga*).”

⁶⁹. In the *Vinayavinicchayaṭikā* (Vin-vn-ṭ II 300,22, Vs. 2852) *āha ca* is used as a *pratīka* (*yathāha ca* in Vs. 2852), and in the *Uttaravinicchayaṭikā* (Vin-vn-ṭ II 445,5) it is likewise a *pratīka* from the introduction of stanza 335.

⁷⁰. *āha ca Vuttiyaṃ*, Mmd B° 20,9 = C° 18,8 (Kacc-v 1,1,10); Mmd B° 80,13 = C° 77,14 (Kacc-v 1,6,11).

⁷¹. *āha ca* Mmd B° 33,28 = C° 31,13 (Kacc-v 1,5,4); Mmd B° 48,7 = C° 45,17 (Kacc-v 1,4,4); Mmd B° 48,21–22 = C° 45,34 (Kacc-v 1,5,24); Mmd B° 60,13 = C° 57,34 (Kacc-v 1,5,4); Mmd B° 61,21 = C° 59,5 (Kacc-v 2,8,45); Mmd B° 85,19 = C° 82,20 (Kacc-v 2,1,44).

⁷². *āha ca* Mmd B° 7,14 = C° 6,28 (Kacc 4,2,1); Mmd B° 220,22 = C° 235,6 (Sv II 383,22, Spk II 77,33, etc).

⁷³. Sadd 579,14–16,18–20,21–23,27–28. The parallels in the *Visuddhimaggamahāṭikā* (I 226; 10th century AD) are given there without any introductory reporting frame. In Dhammapāla's *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭikā* (10th century AD; Ps-pt II 246) all these stanzas are given successively with the reporting frame *bhavanti c' ettha* preceding the first stanza. This reporting frame in that case indicates a quotation of stanzas from a

the name of his source, the *Sāratthadīpanī*.⁷⁴ Summarizing we can say that *āha ca* came into use in Pāli around the 6th century at the earliest, and, since it is completely absent also from many of the younger texts not contained in the CSCD,⁷⁵ it seems to have been in use during the tenth to twelfth centuries, especially in grammatical texts, but not to have become widespread.

Looking at the fourteen *āha c' ettha* references on the CSCD version 4, this quotative in all cases introduces stanzas. The fourteen references are reduced to seven, because of literal parallels. Thus the same three stanzas introduced by *āha c' ettha* are transmitted in Buddhaghosa's *Papañcasūdanī* (I 138,10–16), and *Manorathapūraṇī* (I 95,20–26 with v.l. *āha ettha* in E°), in Dhammapāla's *Itivuttakaṭṭhakathā* (I 82,25–32), and in Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī* (I 89,18–24).⁷⁶ One other stanza is again found in four sources, Buddhaghosa's *Visuddhimagga* (Vism 211,9–11), the *Samantapāsādikā* (I 123,30–32) ascribed to Buddhaghosa, the Anonymous' *Khuddakapāṭhaṭṭhakathā* (108,15–19) and in Upasena's *Mahāniddesaṭṭhakathā* (9th century AD; II 265,16–19). In both instances it is probable that the younger sources copied the passages from the respective older texts. Another stanza is found in the *Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathā* (5th century AD; Paṭis-a I 188,28–36), and Upasena's *Mahāniddesaṭṭhakathā* (Nidd-a I I 139,17–21). It was certainly copied by Upasena who follows the Paṭis-a closely in many places. There remain four stanzas for which we have no parallels introduced by *āha c' ettha*, although all have parallels without or with a different introductory quotative: Sn-a I 317,12–14⁷⁷, Nidd-a I I 8,7–9,⁷⁸ Nidd-a I I 9,2–5,⁷⁹ and six stanzas in the *Abhidh-av-nt* (I 145).⁸⁰

Abbreviations

B^e Edition in Burmese script, refers to the editions in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana series.

different text by the same author (see for that Kieffer-Pülz (in preparation) Appendix: § B 2.3.1). In Sāriputta's *Sāratthadīpanī* (3rd quarter of the 12th century AD) these stanzas are introduced by *tenedaṃ vuccati*, a quotative unique for this text, and this text portion (six references). As frequently Sāriputta here quotes from Dhammapāla's *Visuddhimaggamahāṭīkā*, from which he takes over a larger text portion, only adding the quotative *tenedaṃ vuccati* before the stanzas not introduced by Dhammapāla, possibly an evidence that they were written by himself.

^{74.} In Chapaṭa's commentary (not yet edited) on the 41st stanza of the *Śīmālankārasaṅgaha* the author quotes from Sp-ṭ III 276,1–2.

^{75.} Jā-ṭ, Mhv-ṭ, Paṭis-gp, Upās.

^{76.} These are three stanzas. The Sv-anṭ (1800) gives the same three verses introduced by *vuttañ hi*, a young quotative, see Kieffer-Pülz (in press), § 6. In the two other commentaries by Buddhaghosa only the first two stanzas are given, once without introduction (Sv II 383,20–24), and once introduced by *ten' eva vuttaṃ* (Spk II 77,30–35). For this quotative, see Kieffer-Pülz (in press), § 3. The first verse is transmitted in two *Abhidhamma* commentaries, both times introduced by *ayañ hi* (Kv-a 36,9ff., Moh 266,34ff.), whereas in the *Abhidh-av-ṭ* (II 204) it is introduced by *vuttañ hi' etaṃ Mahā-aṭṭhakathāyaṃ*. So this 13th century commentary is the first to give a source for the first stanza. The Mogg-p-ṭ (13th century AD) quotes it introduced by *tathā ca vuttaṃ*, and the Mil-ṭ (15th century) without an introductory expression.

^{77.} Parallels in Sāriputta's Mp-nt III 58 (*āhu c' ettha*), and in the *Nettiṭṭikā* (109) (*yato vuttaṃ*).

^{78.} Parallel in Vjb 2,2–4 (*uccate*). For the parallelism between Nidd-a I and Vjb, see Kieffer-Pülz 2009.

^{79.} Parallel in Vjb 4,10–11 (without introduction).

^{80.} Stanza 1–6 are found in Dhammapāla's *Udānaṭṭhakathā* (154,5ff.; *tatth' idaṃ* (v.l. *tatthedaṃ*) *vuccati*), and *Itivuttakaṭṭhakathā* (It-a I 138,2ff.: *tatth' etaṃ vuccati*); Stanzas 2–6 are found in the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinīpurāṇaṭīkā* (Sv-pt I 141, 26ff.), the *Papañcasūdanīpurāṇaṭīkā* (Ps-pt I 108), both ascribed to Dhammapāla, in Sāriputta's *Manorathapūraṇī-abhinavaṭīkā* (Mp-nt I 135), and in Nāṇabhivamsa's *Abhinavaṭīkā* to the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* (Sv-anṭ I 318: without introduction).

C ^e	Edition in Sinhalese script.
Chs	Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana Edition, Rangoon.
CSCD	Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana CD-ROM, Version 3.0 (Igatpuri; Vipassana Research Institute, 1999). Contains the canonical and post-canonical Pāli texts based on the Burmese Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition. Version 4.0 (Unicode Version). (Available on CD-Rom or online, see www.vridhamma.org/Chattha-Sangayana-CD-Rom-Update). [Quoted according to the pagination of the European editions if possible. In case no European edition exists, I quote according to the Burmese edition; the pagination in the datafile sometime deviates by about one page from the printed editions].
PTS	Pali Text Society

Bibliography

Primary literature:

- Abhidh-av-ñṭ *Abhidhammāvatāra-ṇaṭṭikā, Abhidhammatthavikāsinī* (CSCD).
- AN *Aṅuttara-Nikāya*, 5 vols., ed. R. Morris, E. Hardy. London, 1885–1900 (PTS).
- As *Atthasālinī. Buddhaghosa's commentary on the Dhammasaṅgani*, ed. Edward Müller. London, revised ed. 1979 [original 1897] (PTS).
- As-mūlaṭ *Ānanda, Atthasālinī-mūlaṭṭikā* (CSCD).
- Bv-a *Madhurattavilāsinī nāma Buddhavaṃsaṭṭhakathā of Bhadantācariya Buddhaddatta Mahāthera*, ed. I. B. Horner. London, 1978 (PTS).
- Bv-a (transl.) *The Clarifier of the Sweet Meaning (Madhurattavilāsinī). Commentary on the Chronicle of the Buddhas (Buddhavaṃsa) by Buddhaddatta Thera*, transl. I. B. Horner. Oxford, 2nd. ed. 2008 [original 1978] (PTS).
- Cp-a *Dhammapāla, Paramatthadīpanī, being the commentary on the Cariyapīṭaka*, ed. D. L. Barua. London, 1979 (PTS).
- Dhp *Dhammapada*, ed. O. von Hinüber and K. R. Norman, with a complete Word Index compiled by Shoko Tabata and Tetsuya Tabata. Oxford, 1995 (PTS).
- DN *Dīghanikāya*, 3 vols., ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. E. Carpenter. London, 1890–1911 (PTS).
- Gv Ivan P. Minayeff (ed.), “Nandapañña, *The Gandhavaṃsa*,” *JPTS* 1886, 54–80.
- It *Itivuttaka*, ed. Ernst Windisch. London, 1975 (PTS).
- It-a *Paramattha-Dīpanī, Iti-vuttakaṭṭhakathā. (Iti-vuttaka commentary) of Dhammapālācariya*, 2 vols., ed. M. M. Bose. London, 1977 (PTS).
- It-a (transl.) *The Commentary on the Itivuttaka. The Itivuttaka-aṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpanī II) of Dhammapāla*, 2 vols., transl. Peter Masefield. Oxford, 2008, 2009 (PTS).
- Jā *Jātaka, together with its commentary being tales of the anterior births of Gotama Buddha*, 7 vols., ed. V. Fausbøll. London, 1877–1897.
- Jā-ṭ *Die Vessantaradīpanī. Ein Pāli-Kommentar aus Nordthailand*, ed. Yukio Yamanaka, PhD Thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg i. Br., 2009.
- Kacc E. Senart, *Kaccāyana et la Littérature grammaticale du Pāli, 1er Partie: Grammaire Palie de Kaccāyana, sūtras et commentaire, publiés avec une traduction et des notes*. Paris 1871.
- Kacc-v *Kaccāyanavuttī*, see Kacc.
- Khp *Khuddakapāṭha*, see Khp-a.
- Khp-a *The Khuddaka-Pāṭha together with its commentary Paramatthajotikā I*, ed. Helmer Smith from a collation by Mabel Hunt. London, 1978 [original 1915] (PTS).
- Khuddas-ñṭ *Sumaṅgalappasādanī nāma Khuddasikkhā-abhinavaṭṭikā*, in: *Khuddasikkhā-Mūlasikkhā, Khuddasikkhā-Purāṇa-Abhinava-Ṭṭikā, Mūlasikkhā-Ṭṭikā*, Rangoon, 1962 (Chs).
- Kkh *Kaṅkhāvitaraṇī by Bhadantācariya Buddhaghosa*, ed. K. R. Norman, William Pruitt. Oxford, 2003 (PTS).
- Mhv *The Mahāvaṃsa*, ed. Wilhelm Geiger, London, 1908 (PTS).
- Mhv-ṭ *Vaṃsatthappakāsinī. Commentary on the Mahāvaṃsa*, 2 vols., ed. G. P. Malalasekera. London, 1977 (PTS).
- Mil *The Milindapañho: Being Dialogues Between King Milinda and the Buddhist Sage Nāgasena*,

- ed. V. Trenckner. Oxford, 1997 (PTS) [original: 1880], in: *The Milindapañho with Milinda-ṭikā*. Oxford, 1997 (PTS).
- Mil-ṭ *Milinda-ṭikā*, ed. Padmanabh S. Jaini. Oxford, 1997 (PTS) [original 1986], in: *The Milindapañho with Milinda-ṭikā*. Oxford, 1997 (PTS).
- Mmd Vimalabuddhi/Vajirabuddhi, *Mukhamattadīpanī. Nyāsa pāṭh*. Rangoon. Sudhammavattī Press, 1933.
- MN *Majjhima-Nikāya*, 3 vols., ed. V. Trenckner, R. Chalmers. London, 1888–1899 (PTS).
- Mogg-p-ṭ *Moggallānapaṇṇikā-ṭikā, Sāratthavilāsini* (CSCD).
- Moh *Mohavicchedanī Abhidhammamātikathavaṇṇanā by Kassapathera of Coḷa*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta, A. K. Warder. London, 1961 (PTS).
- Mp Buddhaghosa, *Manorathapūraṇī, Aṅuttaranikāyaṭṭhakathā*, 5 vols., ed. M. Walleiser, H. Kopp. London, 1924–1956 (PTS).
- Mp-nṭ Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], *Sāratthamañjūsā (Aṅuttaranikāya-ṇaṭṭikā)* (CSCD)
- Nett *The Nettipakaraṇa with extracts from Dhammapāla's commentary*, ed. E. Hardy. London, 1902 (PTS).
- Nidd-a I Upasena, *Saddhammapajjotikā I, Mahāniddesaṭṭhakathā*, 2 vols., ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London, 1980 [original 1931, 1939] (PTS).
- Nidd-a II Upasena, *Saddhammapajjotikā II, Cullāniddesaṭṭhakathā*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London, 1940 (PTS).
- Pālim-nṭ Toṇ-phī-lā charā tō Munindaghosa [Tīpīṭakālaṅkāra, *Pālimuttakavinayavinicchayanavaṭṭikā*] *Vinayālaṅkāraṭṭikā*, 2 vols. Rangoon, 1962 (Chs).
- Paṭis *Paṭisambhidāmagga*, 2 vols., ed. A. C. Taylor. London, 1905–1907 (PTS).
- Paṭis-a *Saddhammapakkāsini. Commentary on the Paṭisambhidāmagga*, 3 vols., ed. C. V. Joshi. London, 1979 [original 1933–1947] (PTS).
- Paṭis-gp *Paṭisambhidāmaggaṭṭhakathāgaṇṭhipadam*.
B° (Rangoon) 1984 (Chs).
C° *Paṭisambhidāmagga-gaṇṭhipadatta-vaṇṇanā*, ed. Ariyavaṃsa, Rājagiriya: Ānanda Sēmagē Mahāsayena, 2510 (1966).
- Peṭ *The Peṭakopadesa*, ed. Arabinda Barua. London, 1982 (PTS).
- Piṭ-sm *Piṭakat-to-sa-muiṇḥ. Mañ:-krī: Mahāsiriyeja-sū, Catalogue of the Piṭaka and Other Texts in Pāli, Pāli-Burmese, and Burmese*, summarized and annotated translation by Peter Nyunt. Bristol, 2012 (PTS).
- Ppk-anuṭ Dhammapāla, *Pañcappakaraṇaṭṭikā* (CSCD).
- Ps Buddhaghosa, *Papañcasūdanī, Majjhimanikāyaṭṭhakathā*, 5 vols., ed. J. H. Woods, D. Kosambi, I. B. Horner. London, 1922–1938 (PTS).
- Ps-pt Dhammapāla, *Līnatthapakāsini II, Papañcasūdanī-purāṇaṭṭikā* (CSCD)
- Pv-a *Petavattu-aṭṭhakathā, Paramatthadīpanī IV*, ed. E. Hardy. London, 1894 (PTS).
- Sadd *Saddanūti. La Grammaire Palie d'Aggavaṃsa*, 3 vols., texte établi par Helmer Smith. Oxford, 2001 [original 1928–1954] (PTS).
- Sīmāl-v Chapaṭa Saddhammajotipāla, *Sīmālaṅkārasaṅgahavaṇṇanā* (Ms.).
- SN *Samyutta-Nikāya*, 5 vols., ed. L. Feer. London, 1884–1898 (PTS).
- Sn *Suttanipāta*, ed. Dines Andersen, Helmer Smith. London, 1913 (PTS).
- Sn-a *Paramatthajotikā II, Suttanipātaṭṭhakathā*, 3 vols., ed. Helmer Smith. London, 1916–1918 (PTS).
- Sp *Samantapāsādikā, Vinayaṭṭhakathā*, 7 vols., ed. J. Takakusu, M. Nagai (and K. Mizuno in vols. 5 and 7). London, 1924–1947 (PTS); vol. 8: Indexes Hermann Kopp. London, o.J. (PTS).
- Sp-ṭ Sāriputta [of Poḷonnaruva], *Sāratthadīpanī*, 3 vols. Rangoon, 1960 (Chs).
- Spk *Sāratthapakāsini, Samyuttanikāyaṭṭhakathā*, 3 vols., ed. F. L. Woodward. London, 1929–1937 (PTS).
- Spk-pt Dhammapāla, *Līnatthapakāsini III, Sāratthapakāsini-purāṇaṭṭikā* (CSCD).
- Sv Buddhaghosa, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini, Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathā*, 3 vols., ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. E. Carpenter, W. Stede. London, 1886–1932 (PTS).

- Sv-ant Ñāṇābhivamsa, *Sumaṅgalavilāsini-abhinavaṭṭikā*, *Sādhujanavilāsini* (CSCD).
- Sv-pt Dhammapāla, *Dīghanikāyaṭṭhakathāṭṭikā Līnatthavaṇṇanā* [*Līnatthapakāsini I, Sumaṅgalavilāsini-purāṇaṭṭikā*], 3 vols., ed. Lily de Silva. London, 1970 (PTS).
- Tha Theragāthā, in: *Thera- and Therī-Gāthā*, ed. Hermann Oldenberg and Richard Pischel, rev. K. R. Norman, L. Alsdorf. London, 2nd ed. 1966 (PTS).
- Tha-a Dhammapāla, *Theragāthāṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpanī)*, 3 vols., ed. F. L. Woodward. London, 1940–1959.
- Thī-a *Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā (Paramatthadīpanī VI)* by Achariya Dhammapāla, ed. William Pruitt. Oxford, 1998 (PTS).
- Thī-a (transl.) *The Commentary on the Verses of the Therīs (Therīgāthā-aṭṭhakathā, Paramatthadīpanī VI)* by Ācariya Dhammapāla, transl. William Pruitt. Oxford, reprint with corrections 1999 (PTS).
- Ud-a Dhammapāla, *Udānaṭṭhakathā, Paramatthadīpanī I*, ed. F. L. Woodward. London, 1926 (PTS).
- Upās *Upāsakajanālaṅkāra*, ed. H. Saddhatissa. London, 1965 (PTS).
- Utt-vn-ṭ *Uttaravinicchayaṭṭikā*, in: *Vinayavinicchayaṭṭikā (Vinayatthasārasandīpanī)*, vol. 2. Rangoon, 1977 (Chs), 401–430.
- Vibh *Vibhaṅga*, ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London, 1904 (PTS).
- Vibh-a *Sammohavinodanī, Abhidhammapiṭake Vibhaṅgaṭṭhakathā*, ed. A. P. Buddhadatta. London, 1923 (PTS).
- Vin-vn-ṭ *Vinayavinicchayaṭṭikā (Vinayatthasārasandīpanī)*, 2 vols. Rangoon, 1977 (Chs).
- Vism Buddhaghosa, *Visuddhimagga*, 2 vols., ed. C. A. F. Rhys Davids. London, 1920–1921 (PTS).
- Vism-mhṭ Dhammapāla, *Paramatthamañjūsā, Visuddhimaggamahāṭṭikā* (CSCD).
- Vjb *Vajirabuddhittherena katā Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā*. Rangoon, 1960 (Chs).
- Vmv Coḷiya Kassapa, *Vimativinodanīṭṭikā*, 2 vols. Rangoon, 1960 (Chs).
- Vv-a Dhammapālam, *Paramatthadīpanī, Part IV Being the Commentary on the Vimāna-Vatthu*, ed. E. Hardy. London, 1901 (PTS).

Secondary literature:

- Adikaram 1953 = E. W. Adikaram, *Early History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, 2nd ed. (original 1945).
- Alsdorf 1957 = Ludwig Alsdorf, “Bemerkungen zum Vessantara-jātaka,” *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens und Archiv für indische Philosophie*, Bd. 1, 1–70.
- Dimitrov (*Jewel Mind*) = Dragomir Dimitrov, *The Legacy of the Jewel Mind. On the Oeuvre of the Buddhist Scholar Ratnamati* (in preparation).
- Güldemann 2008 = Tom Güldemann, *Quotativ Indexes in African Languages: A Synchronic and Diachronic Survey*. Berlin.
- von Hinüber 1996 = Oskar von Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*. Berlin (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies, vol. 2).
- Kieffer-Pülz 2009 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “The Gaṇṭhārambhakathā of Upasena’s Saddhammapajjotikā and Vajirabuddhi’s Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 52, 143–177.
- Kieffer-Pülz 2013 = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, *Verlorene Gaṇṭhipadas zum buddhistischen Ordensrecht. Untersuchungen zu den in der Vajirabuddhiṭṭikā zitierten Kommentaren Dhammasiris und Vajirabuddhis*, 3 Teile. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag (Veröffentlichungen der Indologischen Kommission, 1).
- Kieffer-Pülz (in press) = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “Quotatives indicating quotations in Pāli commentarial literature, I. *Iti* and quotatives with *vuttam*,” Elisa Freschi (ed.), *The Re-use in Indian Philosophical texts* (in preparation).
- Kieffer-Pülz (in preparation) = Petra Kieffer-Pülz, “‘And there is [this stanza] in this connection’. The usage of *hoti/honti/bhavanti c’ ettha* in Pāli commentarial literature,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* (in preparation).
- Norman 1983 = K. R. Norman, *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of all the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Wiesbaden (A History of Indian Literature, VII).